DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 689 CG 005 237

AUTHOR Crookston, Burns B.
TITLE Implications of Drug Usage for Higher Education. Student Development Staff Papers Number One.
INSTITUTION Colorado State Univ., Ft. Collins. Office of the Dean of Students.
PUB DATE Sep 69
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the South Dakota College Public Relations Association Convention, July 19, 1968

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.05
DESCRIPTORS *College Role, College Students, Communication (Thought Transfer), *Cultural Factors, *Drug Abuse, *Social Change, *Student Behavior, Student College Relationship, Student Problems

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the implications of drug usage for higher education. Drug use is not new. However, today there are several problems associated with drug usage: (1) ignorance, (2) semantics, (3) communication, and (4) change as a constant in the world. The reasons for student drug use are discussed. Students use drugs because: (1) they are preconditioned to the legitimacy of drug usage; (2) they want to rebel; (3) they want to escape; (4) they are encouraged by peer group influence; and (5) they are searching for spiritual discovery. Some of the cultural contextual factors include: (1) the generation gap; (2) the educational level of students; (3) the effect of mass communication media; and (4) the awareness of poverty and injustice. Recognizing the various factors, institutions can respond by: (1) creating a climate of openness and trust; (2) making sure information is available; (3) providing source credibility; (4) assisting in the dessemination of alternatives; and (5) attacking the basic problem. (KJ)

ED038689

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT STAFF PAPERS

Number 1

IMPLICATIONS OF DRUG USAGE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Burns B. Crookston

CG005237

Colorado State University
Office of Dean of Students

September, 1969

IMPLICATIONS OF DRUG USAGE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Burns B. Crookston*

My remarks this afternoon are directed toward a discussion of mind altering drugs with particular emphasis on the implications of such usage to higher education. I intend to start out by providing some historical perspective, discuss briefly the current patterns of drug usage, say a few words about background factors, indicate some of the motivations which cause students to turn to drugs and finally to higher education and what we ought to be doing about it.

Background

From a historical point of view there is nothing unique about today's experimentation and use of mind altering drugs with the exception that those currently available are far more powerful than has been the case heretofore. Ever since the dawn of recorded history man has utilized drugs, potions, herbs and other substances to ward off evil spirits, cure sickness, perform miracles and feats of magic, have visions, acquire supernatural powers, communicate with God, or just for kicks.

In relatively modern times, for example, at the turn of the century William James said "the sway of alcohol over mankind is unquestionably due to its power to stimulate the mystical faculties of human nature usually crushed to earth by cold facts and dry criticisms of the sober hour." Going back another half century, Morton in 1848 commented that even before ether was used as an anesthetic, "the students at Cambridge used to inhale sulfuric ether from their handkerchiefs and it intoxicated them and made them reel and stagger." Priestly discovered laughing gas in 1772, but in 1798 Davy inhaled it and his experience augered in a new era of experimentation with another substance. Robert Southey wrote "it produces a pleasurable warmth, laughter, ecstasy, intoxicating placidity and delight." Samuel Taylor Coleridge added, "I experienced the most volumptuous sensations. The

---

* Presentation to the South Dakota College Public Relations Association - July 19, 1968

outer world grew dim and I had the most entrancing visions. I lived in a world of new sensations." Laughing gas became a fad on college campuses before it became an anesthetic in 1846. It was used at dinner parties where it was considered the only genteel way to get drunk. At exhibitions one could inhale it for 25 cents. William James later on said "Nitrous oxide and ether stimulates the mystical consciousness - depth beyond depth." Finally, Peter Mark Roget remarked "Mr. Davy's silk bags hold the keys to paradise."

Compare the above quotations with more recent statements by Aldous Huxley, Timothy Leary, Richard Alpert, and other gurus of the psychedelic movement of the 1960's. Is there not a familiar ring?

Defining the problem

The current use of hallucenogenic drugs by young people has recently been called (using a new phrase which crept into our language) the greatest cop out of all time. A great many people would agree with such a statement. But having said this to those who use drugs regularly or occasionally, and who do not rule out the possibility that they may use drugs again, the dialogue is often unfortunately ended.

But the problem is not that simple and the dialogue must continue. Problems associated with drugs are multiple.

- It is a problem of ignorance. There is a tremendous lack of knowledge of what these chemical substances may do, how they affect the organism and its functioning, etc. There has been a great deal of opinion, sensationalism and misinformation extant about drugs. Fortunately there seems to be an increasing trend during the past year toward responsible journalism and reporting a more balanced picture of the effect of drugs than that characterized in 1966 and 1967.

- It is a problem of semantics, of trying to think, talk, and act rationally in an area terribly entangled in myth and emotion, superstition and irrationality.

- It is a problem of communication among scientists of different disciplines, between scientists and layman, between parents and children, between an older generation brought up before automation, television, jet travel, nuclear energy, the H-bomb, an

affluent society and a younger generation that has known no other conditions.

- It is a problem of living and learning in a world where the only constant is change. And where the future is increasingly unpredictable. This is in marked contrast to earlier generations where one could in the 19th and early 20th century America live out a reasonably predictable life. This was particularly true in the small town and rural America where one could be born, reared and expect to live with reasonable tranquility the rest of his days. The current generation on the contrary must get used to constant insecurity and a life of continued unpredictability. A college graduate, for instance, of this age can expect to live at least a half a dozen different places, have as many as a half a dozen different jobs both in and out of the country. He will have to get used to uncertainty about such moves, about being in different places.

- It is a problem brought about by a pill-oriented society. Thanks to millions spent in advertising and promotion, most of us are well conditioned to the belief there is a "pill for every ill." Increasingly we are buying a well advertised proposition that there is a chemical solution to all unpleasantness and discomfort, whether it be physical, psychological or social. From arthritis to anxiety, from indigestion to tension, from sleeplessness to lack of social or business success, there is somehow a nostrom readily obtainable to provide a remedy.

- Finally drugs are a problem of paradoxes and inconsistancies in our own values. It is paradoxical that a society that spends more money on alcohol, tranquilizers, and sleeping pills than it does on education and the "Great Society." The young will ask, when there are four to eight million alcoholics in this country why all the concern over a small minority using LSD when those in our populations using stimulants and depressants are creating problems far more widespread in our society? They will also point to the paradox that the consumption of tobacco is increasing despite the mounting evidence linking its use to cancer and heart disease, yet this society turns right around and gives millions to find a safe cure for such diseases when the answer is so patently obvious--all people have to do is to quit using it. In his recent book Where Colleges Fail, Nevit Sanford describes

how alcohol education has suffered from society's ambivalent attitude toward drinking. Even though most states now require some education about alcohol, very little time is given to such classes and where it is, the emphasis is more likely to be on the physiological effects of alcohol rather than on the patterns of use and other cultural and sociological aspects. How can one give a balanced presentation of the facts that most people who drink develop no drinking problems, but some numbered in the millions do develop serious problems? Should one face up to the issue of society's ambivalence on this subject? But if such issues are confronted in the classroom there will be all kinds of people outside of the school district who will be unhappy and pressure will be brought to bear. On the other hand if the program avoids facing up to these issues some of the students will be bored. Sanford concludes that alcohol education programs which concentrate on the physiological effects of alcohol are apt to be less effective than those who are concerned with the use and users of alcohol. The same may be also said parenthetically about drug education on the college campus.

The existing problem

How extensive is the current use of drugs on the college campus scene? Ignoring for the moment the common use of drugs by students to stay awake to study for exams, or the use of depressants to get a good night's rest or the use of alcohol, if we limit our comments to the use of so-called hallucenogenic drugs, particularly LSD and marijuana (or pot) the following comment might be useful. The use of LSD appears to be on the wane. It reached its high point about a year ago and although still being used considerably, there has been considerable decline in the last year. There are a number of reasons for this. One is the wide publicity given in the popular press to possible genetic effects of the use of LSD along with some other indications of potential organic damage. Secondly, the NASPA Drug Education project came at a strategic time. The concentrated efforts on the part of a lot of college deans and educators to get drug information widely distributed on college campuses and to initiate other programs including discussions among students and staff along with the bringing of experts to campus all have had their effect in reducing the use of LSD.

But what is probably more important as a factor has been a revolt within the psychedelic cult itself. Ex-associates of Alpert and Leary

such as Allan Cohen have become articulate proponents for "turning off" LSD and other drugs. Such teenage idols as the Beatles and other well known rock groups who had glamorized the use of psychedelics have been turning off. Many of the old "heads" have left the hippie movement and are openly advocating the non-use of drugs. Many of those who turned on to seek a religious or philosophical experience have discovered drugs create an illusion and thus are getting in the way of their seeking true religious experiences. In sum, LSD is still a serious problem but it is not on the increase in colleges and universities. If anything it is decreasing in use and frequency.

This is not true in the case of marijuana. Last week I had lunch in Berkeley with Dr. Joel Fort, one of the leading world authorities on drug usage. He informed me that between two and three tons of marijuana is being brought in across the border from Mexico to California each day. This is not a Mafia type of operation of large quantities being smuggled in by a few, but is the result of literally thousands of individuals bringing in small quantities of the substance for private use or for distribution among associates. Use of cannabis is no longer just by the hippy, "far-out" fringe elements of society, but represents a cross section of ages, degrees of affluence and educational levels. Users range from "Teeny boppers" to highly respected professional persons. In discussions with colleagues in higher education there seems little question that the use of "pot" is on the increase in the college community.

Also on the increase appears to be the use of methedrine, or "speed", a very lethal stimulant which not only can cause brain and other organic damage, but is clearly addicting in a narcotic sense, that is, the organism becomes physiologically dependent upon the substance in the same way that it does to tobacco or heroin.

There is also mounting evidence to indicate that the age level of dangerous drug users is lowering. There are increasing reports of drug usage not only high schools, but even in junior high school groups. The motivation appears to be mainly around getting "kicks" or obtaining "new highs."

Fortunately for us in point of time these movements tend to get generated on the east and west coast and move inward. This gives us in mid-America usually some lead time to prepare for the coming of such movements. But the movement has reached us here, particularly as it relates to marijuana. Many of the dissolutioned hippies and other

psychedelic types have been moving out of the San Francisco Bay area and seeking the "peace and tranquility" of the high country. Colorado now appears to be a major distribution point for marijuana and other drugs.

Why do students use drugs?

1. They are preconditioned to the legitimacy of drug usage. Earlier it was pointed out that we are a pill-oriented society conditioned by not only constant advertising to the idea that it is okay to take almost any kind of drug to relieve a bodily or psychological ill, but also through science and medicine practice we know drugs do work and they are a boon to mankind in the elimination of suffering and disease. So if there is a drug that makes one feel better, peppier, more sociable, more loving, expands consciousness or even makes it possible to see God, why not experiment?

2. To rebel. The desire to get a new high, to take drugs for kicks, to raise hell or generally rebel is predictable behavior for each new generation. The fact that there are laws against the use of certain drugs makes it even more attractive to those who wish to act out against authority.

3. To escape. This is a particularly useful avenue for those who feel that we are living in a sick and hopeless society that is incapable of ending war, racial discrimination, poverty and other adverse conditions of mankind. To these individuals, Leary's dictum "tune in, turn on and drop out" is sweet music.

4. Peer group acceptance and influence. For the adolescent peer group acceptance is a most powerful force. If the use of drugs becomes the "in" thing to do it is difficult for many with strong needs for affection and inclusion to resist.

5. Spiritual discovery. The attraction to the intellectually sensitive college student of the notion that one can become more personally aware, expand ones consciousness, enhance meditation and become "one with God," the lure of hallucenogenic drugs is particularly appealing and attractive. Even though Allan Cohen emphasizes that he is now convinced

> that LSD is just about the worst way to go about attaining expanded awareness or higher consciousness, he states: "after 30 LSD experiences and a near total commitment to the personal and social promise of the psychedelics, I do understand the power, perfundity, and dramatic impact the experience can have."

There are undoubtedly other motives that lead students such as alienation, confusion around ones goals in life or simple curiosity. The above list includes some of the more compelling ones. The point to emphasize here is that causation is invariably multiple, that is one's behavior is more often attributable, not to a single motive, but to a constellation of different motives operating simultaneously in the situation. It is an oversimplication to say that a student uses drugs because he wishes to rebel or because he wishes to escape. This may indeed be the case, but it isn't nearly that simple. Other motives are also operating.

Cultural contextual factors

In addition to the multiple motives that operate within individual students in influencing them to experiment with drugs, the cultural milieu in which the student functions must be considered. It would be tempting indeed to launch into an extensive analysis of the cultural, social, economic, psychological and other environmental factors which need to be taken into account if one is to understand fully the drug scene, but time will not permit such a digression. However, it is useful for us to remind ourselves of certain salient factors.

1. There is a generation gap. Of course there has been such a gap in every generation since the beginning of history. But there are factors that make today's gap particularly significant. For instance, unlike his father who was spawned out of a great depression and was therefore strongly motivated to success out of a value system that measured success in economic and social terms, the college student of today accepts economic security as a given - he has known no other state. Though he may desire material things he no longer views wealth as a transcendental goal. His acute awareness of the complexity of poverty has destroyed that. He does not share the social status needs of his father to get ahead economically or to keep up with the Jones' or to have a two car garage.

2. Educational level of the students. They are way ahead of us in preparation academically and intellectually. Students are learning in the high schools and even the junior high schools what their parents and grandparents were learning in college. The new objectivism in public school curricula has given youth a skeptical mind which he has turned on political, religious, social and economic issues. He is more inquiring, more ready to challenge the existing order.

3. The effect of mass communication media. The transformation of the planet into a solid state audio visual system so well described by Marshall McLuhan has had a profound effect. Abstraction has been rendered obsolete at least in developing a world view. One no longer needs to imagine what it is like on the other side of the planet. He need only to sit in his living room and experience what is going on as it happens.

4. The awareness of poverty and injustice. Earlier generations were often shielded to the suffering of others in our world. Time and distance gave a far away remoteness that led us to feel they were of no direct concern to us. Our sense of personal and physical isolation prior to World War II was understandable. Our young people are acutely aware of local, national and world problems. This awareness partially explains the sense of urgency to "do something about" expressed by our students.

5. The concept of world citizenship. The young of today are indeed the first generation citizens of the world. The emergence of the United States as a major world power with international commitments and responsibility for the welfare of not only the nation but the globe, plus the mass communication media have made it inescapable the perception on the part of this generation that they are indeed world citizens with world responsibilities that transcend national interests.

6. The need to change the established order. No observer of the higher education scene during the past several years would be unaware of the wide testing of new values going on by students, and even by faculty. I believe it is no overstatement to say that we have entered a decade or two during which there are likely to be more profound and dramatic changes in higher

> education than we have seen during the past century. The role of the student in influencing the bringing about of such change cannot be overestimated. The basic purpose of a university education has always been more than merely providing an encounter with stockpiled knowledge; its function has been to enable the young to discover and pursue new questions, to develop a spirit of critical inquiry, and to test accepted propositions. In the eyes of the student this old theoretical definition of the University should become the literal one. The results are not only unsettling, but give promise for an enormously exciting period.

In a recent editorial, Norman Cousins of the Saturday Review commented:

> "The significant thing about many of todays young people is not that they are in revolt but that they are in search of workable guidelines for their lives, their work and their relationships. Their break with the University and with their society in general has less to do with the declared philosophy of the university and society than with the charactering of that same philosophy by those who profess to venerate it. The new young "radicals" are not the affiliated or labeled radicals of the Thirties. They are unwilling to make out blank checks to anyone - whether ideologists or organizations or both. They are hypocrosy spotters. They are less impressed with resounding aims than with direct acts of unquestionable integrity. They react sharply against depersonalization and qualification. They are less impressed, for example with statistics showing the high average annual income of the American family than with the day to day experiences of those who live largely outside the benefits of abundance. They are not quite sure what it is they themselves want of life but they bite shy of the profusion of encumbrances that appear to keep their elders from standing erect and thinking straight."

Commenting on the role of the student in higher education Cousins continues:

> "however much regard they (the students) may have for the superior learning of their teachers, they believe they themselves have something of value in the determination of what it

> is they should be taught and even how they are to be taught. They see themselves not just as receptacles for instruction but as essential participants in the educational experience. They mirror the central tendency of the age - which is the quest for individual respect. Finally they see themselves as thinking people in contrast to their elders who they tend to regard as reflexive rather than reflective, and increasingly subject to computerized decisions."[1]

It is within this larger contextual perspective that we should think together about the drug problem. Surely the drug issue is not in and of itself an isolated instance we can attack and deal with directly without considering its relationship to the larger concerns of the student in higher education.

The response of the institution

Recognizing, then that the problem of drugs on the college campus is one inescapably linked with the issue of student unrest, student power, alienation, discovery of self, growing up and a host of other factors, what are some possible approaches in dealing with the problem? The following guidelines are suggested:

1. Creating a climate of openness and trust. The creation of such a climate is fraught with immediate difficulties and barriers. College students have had a lifetime of practice in developing attitudes and behaviors with respect to authority. Their stance more often than not is one of immediate suspicion if not open hostility toward any attempts on the part of the "establishment" to intervene in their private affairs. And certainly it is easy for students to perceive even the best intentioned efforts on our parts as unwelcomed interventions or outright intrusions. One approach is opening channels of communication is to demonstrate willingness to enter into direct dialogue with students, not only with the established student leadership, but fringe groups as well. In addition to the obvious authority barrier there will be other barriers such as the

---

1 "What Are Young People Telling Us?" Saturday Review, May 18, 1968, p. 28.

legal issue. Students fear talking about drug experimentation with those whom they feel must in one way or another disclose such activities to enforcement authorities. In drug education and counseling the promise of confidentiality is a powerful force toward encouraging openness and trust. It is important that a distinction be made, that we are in the business of education, not law enforcement.

But if there is an official university position or attitude around drug use by students this policy should be made explicit to the students. In such case if the student begins to present self incriminating statements you should advise him immediately of the degree of confidentiality you can guarantee. Bad faith or "finking" on a student without policy being made explicit is disastrous to the overall objective of honesty and openness. If you are not free to discuss such things as an administrator, then you should refer the student directly to a counselor or psychiatrist or physician who has the legal protection of confidentiality and privileged communication.

Another element of creating a climate of openness and trust is our own willingness to level with the students about our own attitudes, our own ambivalences about drugs. One of the first dilemmas we face is the question, "if alcohol, why not pot?" Obviously there is no comfortable answer. The fact that alcohol is socially and culturally acceptable, even if uneasily so, is not a satisfactory answer. The student who has read up on marijuana can say, "Look at the evidence. Marijuana and hashish are socially acceptable in Asia and the near East in the same way that alcohol is in the West." Of course we can answer that while we have our alcohol skidrows in the United States and the European countries there are similar hashish skidrows in Athens, Cairo, Morraco and India. That still will not satisfactorily answer the question. I suppose we can say with some degree of honesty and accuracy that when one uses drugs, whether alcohol or pot, he is making an existential decision; that is, how one chooses to live one's life. I doubt that we could persuade them that using drugs is necessarily an ethical or existential undesirability, but at least we can indicate to the student that in using drugs he is making a statement about how he

wants to live his life. The point then is that pot may be less harmful than booze, but the use of either poses the question, is it a good life style?

Another issue the students will raise in such dialogues is their belief that they should be free to do what they wish with their own body. This again becomes an existential question. We can certainly respond to that question by suggesting another: Can one ever envision an act upon one's self that may result in being harmful that will not affect other people in some way?

The more open and honest a discussion and dialogue can develop on campus the more likely the student is to feel able to seek help in problems including drug usage.

2. Availability of information. Every effort should be made to make as much information about the drug and drug usage available to students (and faculty) as possible. Many institutions are setting up special rooms in the library or in the Student Center where students can get information on a variety of drug related topics. This has been particularly successful when the establishing of such an information room is done on student initiative or some other group of student leaders. Such an information room could range from legal documents concerning the laws on drug usage locally and nationally to research on the effects of drugs. Certainly literature related to consciousness, mysticism and spiritual effects should also be available. There is a rising movement on college campuses in this particular area. It is of significance that the psychedelic spiritual philosophy was drawn heavily from mysticism, oriental philosophy and the concepts of spiritual teachers or "gurus." Ironically several years passed before the leaders of the psychedelic movement discovered the greatest living and past Masters of esoteric thought and practice had unanimously condemned the use of drugs for spiritual gain. The spiritual Masters emphasize that psychedelics can only hinder the attainment of increased consciousness or closeness to God. The LSD experience for example, is compared at its best to a mirage, a super-dream, an illusion which if taken for real makes self development impossible. The

spiritual Master Meher Baba said, "if God can be found through the medium of any drug, God is not worthy of being God."

This discovery that the gurus were against the use of drugs came as quite a shock to many of the psychedelic leaders. The availability of the literature in this area is important to those students who are seeking spiritual discovery.

In sum, it is better that the student find out for himself the facts about drugs than it is for us to try and convince him it is wrong or bad to use them. The more they know about drugs, particularly LSD, the less they are likely to have anything to do with it. Our job is to make as much reliable information as possible available to the students for this purpose.

Source credibility. When objective written material and observations are interpreted to the student through a human communicator, the content can become less important than the communication source. Bringing in of outside experts is always an important and valuable procedure. Somehow the outside "expert", even though he may be no more knowledgeable than local members of the university staff somehow takes on the aura of being more credible and is more likely to be listened to.

It is also important to select an expert the students will listen to. They will tune out individuals who come on as authoritative, moralistic, or judgemental. The advice of students on the relative effectiveness of such speakers should be sought.

The ex-user can be a most valuable resource. We have had great effectiveness at Colorado State University in utilizing the services of professionals who are ex-users, are relatively young in years and who can speak the language of the hippie and other college sub-cultures and can be understood and respected by them. The potential or current drug user will listen to someone with these qualifications. They cannot deny the fact that this

individual has had drug experiences. The usual rationalization such as "he hasn't turned on; therefore how can he know?" doesn't apply. Allan Cohen described an amazing turnabout in LSD use in California high schools where psychedelic fervor had been exploding. When the two original leaders of the movement came back and spread the word that they had stopped using LSD and that it was psychologically and spiritually harmful, a remarkable de-escalation took place.[2]

Students who have used LSD and stopped can function as a valuable liaison on your campus even if they don't make public appearances. They can serve as sympathetic advisors to university staff members as well as acting as informal counselors for students who otherwise could not be reached. We have been able to identify several such students on our campus who have been working very effectively behind the scenes in this particular way.

4. The dissemination of alternatives. In the long run this guideline is probably the most important. Even to well informed students, turning to drugs may seem the best way to approach their life concerns as they see it at the moment. It is a basic counseling principle that you don't take something away from a student unless you replace it with something else. When you ask a student to discontinue drugs you are implying that some other course is more desirable. The student may have already rejected the usual cultural alternatives. But let us not despair. There are a number of better ways to expand consciousness and generate self insight and understanding. It is important for such alternate methods to be made available to the student, perhaps in the same library of drug information mentioned earlier. The range of alternatives go all the way from physical exercises to humanistic psychology, to Eastern mystical practices. Some of these are silence, fasting, artistic expression, awareness exercises, psychotherapy, sensitivity training groups, yoga, meditation, Christian mysticism, etc.

---

2 Allan Y. Cohen, LSD and The Student; approaches to Educational Strategies (Unpublished manuscript, April, 1967)

If funds are, or can be made available an additional step would be to invite visits, talks or demonstrations by experts in these somewhat unusual areas. My contacts around the country tell me that student interest is rapidly growing in such techniques as meditation, awareness exercises and sensitivity training. The NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, the pioneering organization on sensitivity training, reports the 1968 demand for such training has far exceeded previous years. There is no doubt that there will be more and more interest in this and other approaches to human understanding and awareness as powerful alternatives to the drug use.

5. Attack the basic problem. Thus far we have dealt primarily with how to go about reducing, if not eliminating the use of mind altering drugs by students on the college campus. Naturally in so doing we have been attacking only the symptom and not the cause. As noted earlier the motives for turning to drugs are multiple. But we do know that in general the college student of today is often expressing anguish and helplessness over the inability of this country and the world to end war, pestilence, poverty, disease and suffering. The students' quest for relevance and meaning to life is a profound one and it is clear that higher education has not responded to these basic human and spiritual strivings. As suggested earlier we are embarked in an era of unparallel change in higher education. I believe the direction of this change must at least be toward reforms that will make it possible for us to do more to assist the young in finding themselves than has been the case so far.

Reform Change

As a first step we have only to look to our own helping profession variously called student personnel services, student life, student affairs and more recently student development to see some need for radical reform. We need to start out by overhauling our stance and style of relating to the student. Essentially as a profession we have tended to follow diagnostic-remedial models of relating to students. Through the testing movement and the mental health movement which began about 50 years ago we have become very proficient in appraisal and diagnosis - all the way from interest and aptitudes to personnel placement to health diagnosis. But with the exception of the testing and diagnostic functions our stance has been almost entirely one of

reaction or remediation. We have tended to play a very passive, waiting type of role, waiting for something to happen to the student, and then we would react. In the case of student care or general student welfare, housing, food, discipline, etc., we have also performed a control function. We have set up in many cases elaborate rules and conditions governing student's personal and social life on campus and even off campus. We tell the student what he can and can't do and then when he goes ahead and does it anyway we punish him. As student activities and student union advisers we have played a kind of service station approach - the friendly helper. We pass out ping pong balls and let the students play. In the case of counseling we have been a passive, non-directive, client-centered person but again we wait until the student falls apart and then we try to pick up the pieces.

These approaches simply do not fit the temper of the times or the needs of the students. The students have complained loudly and bitterly that we counselors are dehumanized, uncaring, unreachable and "unauthentic." We don't take positions on anything. The student says there is no way to relate to you guys. You're not flesh and blood persons. We can't get at you.

What I am saying is that the old guidance-counselor model no longer will work as a style of relating to students. If we really wish to provide a true learning community then we have to function essentially not as watch and wait reactors, but as professionals who intervene and influence directly in the lives and affairs of the students. What does this mean? It means that we have to stop being merely faculty "advisors" to students. This connotes a relationship where we do not share with the students or participate in his affairs, but sit outside the group and therefore remain emotionally and interpersonally inaccessible. It means we have to start being a part of the "scene". It means that we just do not talk commitment but that we show our own commitment to students in our own lives. It means that we start participating with the students in their activities and if the activities are not relevant, meaningful, or contribute to learning, we try to influence the students directly to change the directions of these activities. What it means is that we become essentially teachers instead of bureaucrats. It means that we ought to become part of student government for example, instead of being only an advisor to it. The students want to sit on faculty government. Okay, then why not have us sit on student government? If student government has any relevance, meaning or importance to the university it ought to be important enough for us to become a legitimate part

of it, not to control, but to exert legitimate influence. This is the kind and quality of relationship the students are asking for and the type of participatory relationship that is necessary in the development of a learning community outside the classroom.

What I am getting at is that while we in the student development area like to point to the rigidity of the academic guild system as being the chief culprit in contributing to the alienation of the college student - of being unable to find relevance in his life and his college education; yet we in our area have become just as rigid, just as resistent to change. On some of the larger campuses we have set up a bureaucracy system that would rival the Pentagon. We have developed a maze of offices, forms procedures and spend increasingly more time managing the system and less with the student himself. All of us should periodically analyze how much time we spend with "oiling the machine" as compared with direct contacts with students.

Perhaps the greatest symbol of our resistance to change is in our own nomenclature. The term student personnel services should have gone out of style with the great depression. It has long since ceased to be descriptive of what our central function professes to be: <u>the development of the student as a person and effective citizen</u>. All the term student personnel services does is re-enforce in the mind of the students, faculty colleagues and the public that we are essentially an ancillary bureaucracy with no significant educational function. And as long as we continue to see ourselves in this way, they are right.

<u>Concluding comment</u>

In the final analysis the question is resolved in the goal achievement of the educational institution. Is it the role of the college to turn out individuals who are personally mature enough, secure enough and creative enough to cope with the unbelievably complex humane problems which lie ahead or is it enough simply to produce individuals who are trained to meet the requirements of an ever increasing gross national product? Can a society which is building an undreamed of amount of leisure and dehumanizing much work continue to invest its educational effort exclusively in preparing for that work?

This is essentially what the drug problem is all about. In the words of Helen Nowlis, "Adults with their alcohol and tranquilizers

and young people with their marijuana and LSD are both reacting to conditions which negate human values and human worth, whether these be inherent in the individual or expectation fostered by society. The main difference is that the adults' drugs of choice are depressants, taken to blunt the pain. The young peoples' drugs of choice are perceived at least by some of the more serious, rightly or wrongly as an attempt to strike back at, to seek insight into, to protest what they feel is the cause of the pain. It is a reasonable prediction that if all drugs were eliminated from the scene the search would go on in some other form, perhaps more intolerable to society. Perhaps less."[3]

---

3 Helen Nowlis, Drugs on the College Campus, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Detroit, Michigan, 1967.